

From: [Coltrain, Katrina](#)
To: [Todd Downham](#); [Turner, Philip](#); [Patrick Appel \(pappel@eaest.com\)](#)
Subject: draft letter content for residential data results
Date: Wednesday, February 1, 2017 8:29:00 AM
Attachments: [Wilcox RIFS - Ground Water Well Detection Tables.xlsx](#)
[Residential letter Soil Gas Results.xlsx](#)
[residential GW-AIR-PGAS letter draft example.docx](#)
[image002.png](#)

All, please find attached draft language that will be included in letters to residents. Please send any feedback been going round and round with appropriate way to organize and report. Depending on the nature of the sampling, some or all of the language may be included. For example, a property that has passive gas, ground water, and vapor intrusion data would have all language whereas a property with only ground water data would have ground water language.

All GW wells have data below MCLs, ALs, and/or RSL. The language would be the same for all residents.

GW-10 – LNAPL well language is specific only to this well.

Indoor air language is similar. Concentrations just exceed the RSLs. Used language similar to that in the soil letters—RSL, not a trigger, not unacceptable in short-term, further evaluation in HHRA.

Passive Gas for around Tank 5: language dependent on whether we think additional soil gas sampling is needed.

Question: should we consider sub-slab soil gas based on the results of F6 (red arrow)?

Naphthalene (39ng) and 2-methylnaphthalene (68ng). A general conversion is ng to mg/m³. So if the screening numbers for naphthalene are 0.083 ug/m³ (10⁻⁶) and 3.1 ug/m³ (HI=1), then we should look at soil gas? The only other location that had hits is H4 (blue arrow) and its approximately 100 feet north (concentrations much higher). Grid is 50x50ft.



Katrina Higgins-Coltrain
Remedial Project Manager
US EPA Region 6
LA/OK/NM Section (6SF-RL)
1445 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75202
214-665-8143